

1 RANDALL S. LUSKEY (SBN: 240915)
2 rluskey@paulweiss.com
3 **PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON**
4 & **GARRISON LLP**
5 535 Mission Street, 24th Floor
6 San Francisco, CA 94105
7 Telephone: (628) 432-5100
8 Facsimile: (628) 232-3101

9 ROBERT ATKINS (*Pro Hac Vice forthcoming*)
10 ratkins@paulweiss.com
11 **PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON**
12 & **GARRISON LLP**
13 1285 Avenue of the Americas
14 New York, NY 10019
15 Telephone: (212) 373-3183
16 Facsimile: (212) 492-0183

17 *Attorneys for Defendants*
18 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; and RASIER, LLC

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

KATHERINE HYLIN, an individual

Plaintiff,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a Delaware
Corporation; RASIER, LLC, a Delaware Limited
Liability Company; and DOES 1 through 50,
Inclusive.

Defendants.

Case No. 3:23-cv-01630-AMO

**REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE
IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. AND
RASIER, LLC'S MOTION TO
TRANSFER VENUE TO THE
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

Date: August 17, 2023
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Courtroom: 10 – 19th Floor

Action Filed: April 5, 2023
Trial Date: None Set

1 TO THIS HONORABLE COURT:

2 Defendants Uber Technologies, Inc. and Rasier LLC (“Uber”) request that the Court take
 3 judicial notice, pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201, of certain evidence in support of its
 4 Motion to Transfer Venue to the Central District of Illinois.

5 Under Federal Rule of Evidence 201, a federal court may take judicial notice of facts that
 6 “can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be
 7 questioned.” Fed R. Evid. 201(b)(2). Judicial notice of such facts must be taken when requested
 8 by a party who supplies the court with the necessary information. *Id.* Rule 201(c)(2). Proceedings
 9 and orders by other courts, whether in the state or federal system, may be judicially noticed.
 10 *Duckett v. Godinez*, 67 F.3d 734, 741 (9th Cir. 1995); *Dawson v. Mahoney*, 451 F.3d 550, 551 n.1
 11 (9th Cir. 2006).

12 Uber respectfully requests the Court take judicial notice of the following orders by the
 13 Superior Courts of California related to Uber’s Motion to Transfer Venue to the Central District
 14 of Illinois.¹

15 1. The Superior Court of California for the County of San Francisco’s January 23, 2023 Order
 16 granting Uber’s Motion to Stay or Dismiss Based on *Forum Non Conveniens* in *In re Uber*
 17 *Rideshare Cases*, CJC-21-005188. This document is attached as **Exhibit 1** to the Declaration of
 18 Randall S. Luskey in Support of Uber’s Motion to Transfer Venue to the Central District of Illinois.

19 2. The Superior Court of California for the County of San Francisco’s August 11, 2017 Order
 20 Granting Uber’s Motion to Dismiss Based on *Forum Non Conveniens* in *Jane Doe v. Uber Techs.,*
 21 *Inc.*, CGC-17-556481. This document is attached as **Exhibit 2** to the Declaration of Randall S.
 22 Luskey in Support of Uber’s Motion to Transfer Venue to the Central District of Illinois.

23 3. The Superior Court of California for the County of San Francisco’s March 24, 2020 Order
 24 Granting Uber’s Motion to Stay Based on *Forum Non Conveniens* in *Jane Doe v. Uber Techs.,*

25
 26

¹ These orders are not subject to N.D. California Local Rule 3-4(e) because they have not been
 27 designated as “NOT FOR CITATION” by any court. By contrast, under California Rule of
 28 Court, only California appellate decisions that are not certified for publication are not considered
 citable in California proceedings. Cal. Ct. R. 8.1115(a). That rule does not address trial court
 decisions like the ones that are the subject of this request for judicial notice.

1 *Inc.*, CGC-19-579901. This document is attached as Exhibit 3 to the Declaration of Randall S.
2 Luskey in Support of Uber's Motion to Transfer Venue to the Central District of Illinois.

3 4. The Superior Court of California for the County of San Francisco's July 1, 2019 Order
4 Granting Uber's Motion to Dismiss Based on *Forum Non Conveniens* in *Gorne & Walker v. Uber*
5 *Techs., Inc.*, CGC-19-575852. This document is attached as Exhibit 4 to the Declaration of
6 Randall S. Luskey in Support of Uber's Motion to Transfer Venue to the Central District of Illinois.

7
8 DATED: June 5, 2023

**PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON &
GARRISON LLP**

9
10 By: /s/ Randall S. Luskey
11 RANDALL S. LUSKEY
12 ROBERT ATKINS

13 *Attorney for Defendants*
14 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
15 and RASIER, LLC

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28